State of Montana Information Technology Board

Council Meeting Minutes
June 2, 2016
10:00 a.m.
State Capitol - Room 152

Members Present:

Sheila Hogan, DOA, Chair
Kenneth Bailey, OPI
Tim Bottenfield, DOR
Joe Chapman, DOJ
Susan Fox, LEG
Stuart Fuller, DPHHS
Kreh Germaine, DNRC

Evan Hammer, MSL
Mike Kadas, DOR
Chris Mehl, Bozeman
George Parisot, DLI
Amy Sassano, OBPP
Tyler Trevor, CHE
✍ Mandi Hinman, PSC

Staff Present:

Jennifer Schofield
Noah Horan

Guests Present:

Becki Kolenberg, James Schneider, Tammy Stuart, Matt Van Syckle, Audrey Hinman, Greg Snortland, Samantha Mongoven, Al Parisian

✍ Real-time Communication:

Dan Chelini, Maura Gruber

Welcome and Introductions

Sheila Hogan welcomed the council to the June 2, 2016 ITB meeting. All members and guests were introduced.

Minutes

The council reviewed and approved the March 3, 2016 Minutes.

Business

IT Convergence Executive Order

Lynne Pizzini gave a brief overview of the Executive Order, which was signed on May 24, 2016. The Order provides for the Convergence of IT Infrastructure into the Enterprise system. A project team has been formed and a draft work plan has been developed. A project SharePoint site has been created, which contains all project information. SITSD has begun meeting with agencies to plan for the transition. Communication is a priority for SITSD as this transition is carried out, and as such a communication plan has been included in the project plan. The Order does not represent a wholesale consolidation of IT, but focuses on infrastructure and Enterprise-based services. Agency IT staff are not moving, and SITSD is not adding additional positions. The Order applies to all agencies excluding elected-official agencies and those agencies exempted in the Montana Information Technology Act. There will be a modification of the agency Procurement Delegation Agreement, which is being done by State Procurement. Some existing term contracts will also be amended. The intention is to provide effective and efficient use of Enterprise resources statewide.

Sheila Hogan asked the Board for any questions or comments regarding the Executive Order.

Stuart Fuller: The Department of Public Health and Human Services fully supports the Order. We believe it will help drive down rates, and in general will better support the needs of DPHHS.

Susan Fox: Legislative Services is one of the exempted agencies, but we are looking into voluntarily adopting Convergence for the potential savings. We would require timely support and customer service from SITSD in order for this transition to work for us.

Jennifer Schofield: I want to note that we have a Convergence team working through these issues. Tammy Stuart (tstuart@mt.gov) is the Project Manager. She would be glad to field any and all questions, comments, or concerns.

George Parisot: The Department of Labor and Industry is fully supportive of this as well. The majority of our environments are already moving to the Enterprise. We are already fully using Enterprise Content Management. SITSD has been very responsive providing service to us when it is needed.

Sheila: Everyone should always feel free to call either Ron Baldwin or myself directly. This is very important and we want to make this work as flawlessly as possible.

Long-Range IT Planning (HB 10)
Lynne Pizzini introduced SITSD's new Financial Management Services Bureau Chief James Schneider, and mentioned that he should be seen as a resource for agencies.

Lynne mentioned that SITSD has met with several agencies regarding potential HB 10 requests, which were due June 1, 2016. The CIO will be meeting with the Budget Director over the next several months to develop these requests. Once HB 10 requests are settled, we will be presenting them in Volume 9 of the Governor's Budget.

Executive Budget IT Volume (Volume 10)
Amy Sassano: During the last Legislative Session, there were a handful of agencies who participated in the IT Subcommittee. The agencies involved attempted to present their IT budgets without having a consistent definition of what constitutes an IT budget. One of the key things we came away with is the need for a consistent set of rules for defining an IT budget, and that those rules should be implemented in order to report on each agency's budget. Ron Baldwin committed to the subcommittee and the Legislature that we would come forward with a separate Volume of data, Volume 10, that gives an overview of agency IT spending.

This week, State Accounting sent out an email regarding the SABHRS query that will report on IT expenditures. There is a set of IT job codes that will say what positions we would count for IT budgets, and then there is an accounting policy that listed a set of IT expenditure reports that will say what expenditures we would include in that report as well. We will not include rent, office supplies or other things of that nature. It is up to the agencies to use those accounts as agreed upon consistently in order to have a consistent set of data. That report gives us one fiscal year of IT expenditures, in this case FY 2016.

The context and paradigm of how we build budgets going forward has changed, and so the starting point for development of the FY 2018 and 2019 budgets is not actual third-level expenditures. We are going to build a budget from an FY 2017 appropriation, which is at second- or first-level.

The challenge is that the Legislature wanted to see not only what IT expenditures were in a given year, but also a window of what IT budgets are. We need a mechanism to create or simulate IT budgets because we are not going to have them for FY 2017. There is not an automated way to create them. We at the Budget Office got a handful of agency folks together and talked through some of the options we had for simulating an FY 2017 budget. One option was to take whatever percentage the FY 2016 actual IT expenditures were, and carry that percentage forward. Everyone was uncomfortable with that option, and felt that it could come with a lot of inaccuracies, so the option that was agreed upon was that we are going to have to create it manually.

The fiscal staff in your agencies are going to get a spreadsheet in September 2016, and because this is not a statutory part of the budget request, we do not have to meet the September 1, 2016 deadline. In the spreadsheet, you will have all of your FY 2016 IT expenditure actuals, and we will have a picture of what was spent on IT positions and IT job codes in the personal services category. We will prepopulate based on the snapshot of your IT budget for FY 2017 IT positions. From there agencies will be asked to populate FY 2017 IT budget, and what you anticipate spending in those other expenditure categories for IT. We are providing the FY 2016 actuals that will hopefully allow you to avoid creating all of this data from scratch. Once you have filled that in, you are going to need to fund it. The IT budget needs to live within the FY 2017 budget you already have. If the budget for your agency as a whole is $100, then you cannot submit an IT budget for $150, because obviously you cannot spend more than you have.

We will have a third-level expenditure account of what your IT incremental budget requests are for FY 2018 and FY 2019, for either IT positions or IT purchases. Then we will add together that data from IBARS, along with the data that you populated in the FY 2017 budget spreadsheet that we sent out, to create an in-total FY

2018 and FY 2019 budget. We will move the data from Volume 1's IT section to Volume 10, and there will be a summary of HB 10 in Volume 10 to collectively present what the IT budget requests are for the agencies.

The exact format of the spreadsheet that will come out in September is still a work in progress. We do not have any way of verifying what you put in that spreadsheet beyond ensuring that it does not add up to more than your entire budget for your agency. So we ask that you be reasonable and realistic about what you put in the spreadsheet, and make your best estimate. To my knowledge, based on conversations that Ron and I have had with the Legislative Fiscal Division staff, they will be recommending to the Legislative Finance Committee next week that there not be a separate IT subcommittee next session. The rates for SITSD will be discussed in the Section A subcommittee, and then to the extent that any of the individual subcommittees want to discuss individual IT budgets, at least the information that is provided will be consistent across all agencies.

The Budget Office and SITSD both have statutory obligations through MITA to publish certain things in the budget. From the Budget Office perspective we plan to now meet those statutory obligations through Volume 10. It was a commitment that Ron made to the Legislature that we would figure out a consistent way to report on what agencies were spending and budgeting for IT. It is out of our hands what the Legislature chooses to do with the information given. Legislative staff plans to recommend to them that it is an informational document and that the decision-making documents are business as usual for individual subcommittees. I think mostly the Legislature just wanted to get a sense of how much money is being spent on IT and what we are getting for it.

Q: Kenneth Bailey: Will Volume 10 be an ongoing thing for years to come?
A: Amy: The level of work that it takes to generate this volume, along with the level of detail that will be lost by moving to a budget starting point rather than an actual expenditure starting point, makes the development of this Volume even more complicated going into the future. Reports come and go. IT will always be a hot topic. We will continue to gauge interest in years to come to see if this Volume is something that people will continue to read.
Kenneth: I understand that each agency is going to be allowed to prepare an annotation regarding what they think is wrong with the way information is being gathered. If this Volume isn't going to go away in future years, I would recommend the process be straightened out so that costs can be recorded accurately.
Amy: We don't want to get into the debate of details again, but I know there is some concern from multiple agencies regarding position codes, for example, and this will be an ongoing conversation.
Kreh Germaine: Is there going to be a way to explain certain expenditures in the September spreadsheet?
Amy: Some preface language in the report saying which types of things are included will certainly be drafted.

Enterprise Content Management Perceptive Content Update
Audrey Hinman mentioned that the FileNet to Perceptive Content migration is going well. There have been a few changes to the migration schedule, which can be found on the ITMC website. SITSD is working with Lexmark regarding these applications migration issues. Audrey's staff has been contacting the program people directly within agencies and is providing just-in-time training. There are a couple of projects in production, such as a Department of Labor and Industry system which has moved into the Enterprise environment. Several other agencies are in the testing phase.

Q: Kreh Germaine: Our agency is concerned about finishing testing before FileNet expires at the end of the month. Will there be coverage for any potential gap between services?
A: Audrey: Water Rights is one such system that is in testing right now. We are working diligently with Lexmark to overcome these issues. SITSD has the option to pay IBM for continued services to cover the gap in the event that systems are not ready by July 1, 2016.

MT-ISAC Update
Lynne Pizzini reported regarding recent developments in MT-ISAC. The Assessment Workgroup is developing a Governor's Dashboard on a monthly basis for the Governor's Office. The Dashboard provides information from a national perspective on cyber threats, as well as identifying major national incidents, and major state government incidents. Also included are items from SITSDs monthly Incident Report, such as identified attempts to breach our network, which is consistently over one billion per month. The Dashboard also provides information on training and awareness, as well as any important news from the cybersecurity perspective that is pertinent to the State of Montana.

MT-ISAC also approved an Assessment Tool for agencies to utilize to gauge whether they are in compliance with the new state policy that was approved last fall. The Assessment Tool is being piloted by various agencies, who will report back at the July meeting of MT-ISAC.

The Best Practices workgroup produced a Device Hardening best practices document that has been approved by the Council. The Council also approved the Small Cyber Incident Handling process document, which includes step-by-step instructions on how to respond to malware, viruses, or other small incidents on a desktop device. Things currently being reviewed by the Council for approval include a Disposal of Media Storage Devices process, and a Large Cyber Incident Handling process.

The Situational Awareness workgroup has created a standardized Incident Report form for use with the Incident Handling process, which is out on the MINE site and available for agencies to use.

The IRS and the Social Security Administration recently completed their respective audits. The preliminary results of the IRS audit were very positive. A couple of areas identified as progressive include the Risk Assessment process, which was complimented as one of the best the auditor had ever seen in State or Federal Government, and SITSD's server and storage infrastructure, which scored a 92% compliant and a 99% compliant respectively. Both of these scores are very high, and in fact the storage compliance score of 99% was the highest the auditors had seen. The Social Security Administration audit only took a few hours.

Stuart Fuller: I wanted to express my support for the Best Practices workgroup, and encourage other agencies to participate, because one of the reasons we were successful in these audits was due to some of the documentation that has been produced by the workgroup.

Mike Kadas: Thanks from the Department of Revenue, the audits were helpful, and I think we did very well.

Montana Interactive Update

Becki Kolenberg handed out a pair of reports for the Board to review. Becki provided a report overview of the eGovernment services Montana Interactive (MI) currently provides. The report also mentioned recent awards, including the State Scoop Award received by the State of Montana for its Business Navigator program. The Office of Economic Development went on a roadshow to promote the Business Navigator to small businesses and received positive feedback. The Navigator has been nationally recognized twice. Becki mentioned that MI does not charge the state for the development and ongoing maintenance of eGov services, but rather MI's costs are recouped via a convenience fee for any eGov monetary transaction services.

Q: Mike Kadas: At the next meeting, could you provide a breakdown of FY 2016 financial figures, particularly in regards to how much is state, how much is local, and also what your fees are?
A: Becki: Absolutely.
Q: Sheila Hogan: Is there an accounting on each project, such as a net loss or gain individually?
A: Becki: We don't break it down to the individual service level in this report, but we do provide a report quarterly to Linda Kirkland with SITSD.
Q: Tim Bottenfield: Can you account for the spike in service calls during the first quarter of 2016?
A: Becki: At the start of the year there were several big deadlines. Additionally, we now have a third person working for our service desk, so we are able to field more volume. We implemented a new customer service ticketing system, so I suspect that it's less a spike in service calls and more that our numbers are now more accurate.
Q: Chris Mehl: Regarding the Business Navigator, a while ago the Gallatin valley area created a site selector regarding commercial real estate available in the area. What has happened to the site selector and could it be incorporated into the Business Navigator?
A: Becki: That question is probably better answered by the Governor's Office of Economic Development. I believe they have a site selector they are using, but it was not an effort that MI was involved in.
A: Audrey Hinman: My staff built the site selector, which is available on the Business Navigator right next to the Business Checklist. They are two separate systems, but they are both accessed by ePass MT.
Q: Chris: What is considered success in regards to the Business Navigator and the site selector? What metrics are we using to define success?
A: Audrey: We do have a dashboard provided to John Rogers in the Governor's Office that tracks all visits, expenses, and new businesses registering through the Business Navigator system. Regarding the site selector, we track the number of reports accessed and the number of visits.

Adjournment

Next Meeting
September 8, 2016, 10:00 a.m.
State Capitol Room 152

Member Forum
Chris Mehl: I will speak with my fellow commissioners and other local entities and pass along a few agenda requests for the September meeting.

Public Comment
None.

Adjourn
The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.